



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CP

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/032,521

10/19/2001

Wilf Koenders

0100024

6872

26874

7590

07/02/2004

FROST BROWN TODD, LLC
2200 PNC CENTER
201 E. FIFTH STREET
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

EXAMINER

PRONE, JASON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/032,521	KOENDERS, WILF	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason Prone	3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10,12-16,18 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10,12-16,18 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Handwritten initials: GP

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-5, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura in view of Hakkaku. Miura discloses the invention including a coil support adapted to support a coil such that the coil may rotate about the coil axis to unroll an end portion (141 and 142), a substantially flat sheet support adapted to support the end portion (110 in Fig. 5), a cutting head mounted above the sheet support and end portion (122), a cutting head drive operative to move the cutting head back and forth along a first path parallel to the coil axis (121), a computer operative to control the cutting head (Column 1 lines 5-9), a sheet drive operatively to move the end portion forward and rearward along a second path substantially perpendicular to the coil axis (160), computer controls the coil drive and the sheet drive (Column 2 lines 57-63), a plurality of straitening roller capable of flattening the end portion such that it lies flat on the sheet support (111 and 112 in Fig. 5), that the sheet support is oriented such that there is an open space beneath the end portion under the first path (Fig. 4), that the sheet support comprises a pair of support rollers defining the opening space there-between (111 and 113) but fails to disclose a coil drive operable to rotate the sheet coil, that the computer operates the coil drive, that the computer is operative to rotate the

Art Unit: 3724

sheet coil in a sheet advancing and a sheet retracting direction, and that the computer is capable of maintaining a slack portion. Hakkaku teaches a coil drive operable to rotate the sheet coil (98), that the computer operates the coil drive (96), that the computer is operative to rotate the sheet coil in a sheet advancing and a sheet retracting direction (Fig. 3), and that the computer is capable of maintaining a slack portion (Fig. 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Miura with a computer controlled coil drive, as taught by Hakkaku, to assist the Y-direction motor when by preventing any additional forces being added to the work piece that would cause damage.

3. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura in view of Hakkaku as applied to claims 1-5 above, and further in view of Ominato. Miura and Hakkaku disclose the invention but fail to disclose a measuring device operable to transmit information respecting the position of the end portion. Ominato teaches a measuring device operable to transmit information respecting the position of the end portion (11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Miura in view of Hakkaku with a measuring device, as taught by Ominato, to for prevent unwanted cutting actions.

4. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura in view of Hakkaku further in view of Ominato as applied to claims 2 and 6 above. Miura, Hakkaku, and Ominato disclose the invention but fail to disclose that the measuring device comprises a wheel bearing including a resilient surface or a plurality

Art Unit: 3724

of teeth. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the measuring device of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient. The measuring device disclosed by Ominato is considered the equivalent to the measuring device disclosed in the present application. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47.

5. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura in view of Hakkaku as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Caraballo. Miura and Hakkaku disclose the invention but fail to disclose a first guide roller that is fixed and bears against a first edge of the end portion, a second guide roller biased against an opposite edge, a third guide roller fixed and bearing against the first edge of the end portion between the first guide roller and the coil, and a fourth guide roller biased against the second edge of the end portion between the second guide roller and the coil. Caraballo teaches a first guide roller that is fixed and bears against a first edge of the end portion (64), a second guide roller biased against an opposite edge (28), a third guide roller fixed and bearing against the first edge of the end portion between the first guide roller and the coil (66), and a fourth guide roller biased against the second edge of the end portion between the second guide roller and the coil (32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Miura in view of Hakkaku with a measuring device, as taught by Caraballo, to keep the work piece in line.

Art Unit: 3724

6. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura in view of Hakkaku further in view of Ominato, and Caraballo as applied to claims 2-10 and 12-16 above. In light of the apparatus rejection, the method is inherent.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-10, 12-16, 18, and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Rosenthal et al., Takeuchi, and Cleave et al.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Prone whose telephone number is 703-605-4287. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00, Mon - (every other) Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan N. Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/032,521

Page 6

Art Unit: 3724

A stylized handwritten signature, possibly reading 'JP', consisting of a large loop and a vertical stroke.

JP
June 23, 2004

A handwritten signature, possibly reading 'AS', consisting of a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke.

Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700